REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-44 remain in the application with claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 20, 23, 32, and 42 having been amended hereby and claim 8 having been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the objection to the drawing in which Fig. 12 is alleged to be incorrect.

The specification has been amended hereby to agree with Fig. 12 because in fact it is a 4 X 8 decoder, as shown Fig. 13, for example.

Reconsideration is requested of the objection to the disclosure as containing informalities.

The instances noted by the examiner have been corrected in the changes made to the specification hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection to claims 5, 10, 20, 32, and 42.

The instances noted by the examiner have been corrected in the amendments made to the claims hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the objection of claims 1-7, 16, 21, and 22 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,309) in view of Feamster.

Sato et al. '309 relates to a decoding apparatus for decoding from compressed picture data of a first resolution moving picture data of a second resolution lower than the first resolution. First and second inverse orthogonal transform circuits are provided in which certain coefficients of frequency components in the vertical direction of an orthogonal transform

block are set to zero to reduce the amount of processing without adversely affecting the picture quality.

Feamster relates to an algorithm for decoding compressed bit streams containing field-coded interlaced video in order to produce a lower rate compressed bit stream as a way of speeding up the decoding process.

As explained in the present specification, the present invention relates to an image data converting apparatus for converting first compressed image data to second compressed image data being more compressed than the first image data. A feature of the present invention, as shown for example in Fig. 13 and described at page 29 line 18 through page 30, is that the image data decoding means comprises compression in first discrete-cosine transform means of a frame-discrete cosine transform mode, wherein the compression inverse discrete-cosine transform means of the frame-discrete cosine transform mode performs the inverse discrete cosine transform by using a part of the coefficients included in the (4 X 8)th-order discrete cosine transform coefficients input to achieve the field-discrete compression inverse discrete cosine transform. This is performed by replacing remaining coefficients by 0's, thereby discarding the remaining coefficients.

That is, in the frame DCT mode, some of the (4 X 8)th-order discrete cosine transform coefficients may be replaced by 0's, as shown in Fig. 13. If this is the case, the amount of data to be processed can be reduced, while causing virtually no deterioration of the image quality.

22

Claims 1 and 23 have been amended hereby to include the above-noted features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that neither of the cited references show or suggest this feature of the present invention as discussed above, and thus fail to render obvious the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 11, 12, and 15 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato et al. '309 (Sato 1) in view of Feamster and further in view of Sato '018 (Sato 2).

Claims 11, 12, and 15 depend from claim 1 which for the reasons set forth hereinabove is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references, and for at least those very same reasons, claims 11, 12, and 15 are also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

Reconsideration is respectfully of the rejection of claims 8, 9, 13, and 14 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato 1 in view of Feamster and further in view of Sato et al. '056 (Sato 3).

Claims 8, 9, 13, and 14 depend from claim 1, which as amended hereby is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and for at least those very same reasons claims 8, 9, 13, and 14 are also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato 1 in view of Feamster and further in view of Boon.

23

Claim 17 depends from claim 1 which as amended hereby is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato 1 in view of Feamster and further in view of Ueno.

Claim 19 depends from claim 1 which as amended hereby is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and it is submitted that Ueno does not cure the deficiencies of the primary reference.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato 1 in view of Feamster and further in view of Satou.

Claim 20 depends from claim 1 which in its amended form is now thought to be patentably distinct and, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 imparts of that patentability.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 23-29, 38, 43, and 44 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato 1 in view of Feamster.

These method claims contain the exact same limitations in a method step format that are included in claim 1, and for the above-stated reasons the method claims are also submitted to be patentably distinct over the cited references.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 33, 34, and 37 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato 1 in view of Feamster and further in view of Sato 2.

These claims depend from amended claim 23 which for the reasons set forth hereinabove is thought to be patentably

distinct over the cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, dependent claims 33, 34, and 37 are also submitted to be patentably distinct.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 30, 31, 35, and 36 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato 1 in view of Feamster and further in view of Sato 3.

For the reasons set forth hereinabove it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 23 is patentably distinct, and it is submitted that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the cited references.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 41 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato 1 in view of Feamster and further in view of Ueno.

Claim 41 depends from claim 23 which in its amended form is thought to be patentably distinct and for at least those above-stated reasons, claim 41 is also submitted to be patentably distinct over the combination of references.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 42 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Sato 1 in view of Feamster and further in view of Satou.

Claim 42 depends from amended claim 23 which is thought to be patentably distinct over the combination of references.

Notice is respectfully taken of the indication that claims 10, 18, 32, and 40 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112 and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Nevertheless, by reason of the amendments made to the independent claims hereby, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable in their dependent form.

Accordingly, by reason of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that a method and apparatus for image data conversion as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims is neither shown nor suggested in the cited references, alone or in combination.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM:tb

26